

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants

A Guide for the Preparation of State Grant Applications For Improving Teacher Quality

**Title II, Higher Education Act
(CFDA No. 84.336A)**

**Closing Date
June 12, 2000**

**Form Approved:
OMB No. 1840-0007: Exp. Date 03/31/2003**

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1840-0007. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average **200** hours, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. **If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to:** U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651. **If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to:** Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program, U.S. Department of Education, 1990 K Street, NW, Room 6148, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	
Dear Applicant Letter	
The Challenge: Ensuring a High Quality Teaching Force For Our Nation's Classrooms	1
Facing The Challenge: The Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program	3
State Grants Program Overview	5
Allowable Use of Funds	5
Components of Change for State Grant Applications.....	6
Leadership and Partners.....	6
Systemic Change and Policy Alignment	7
Sustainability.....	8
Teacher Recruitment Component within a State Grant Application: An Overview	10
Effectiveness of Project Activities	12
Other Application Requirements	12
Selection Criteria for State Grant Program Applications.....	14
Other Vital Program Information	19

APPENDICES

Instructions and Forms:	29
- Intent to Submit Form.....	30
- Application Procedures.....	31
- Duns Number Instructions.....	34
- Application for Federal Education Assistance (Form ED 424) *	
- Instructions for Form ED 424 (Face Sheet)	*
- Instructions for Preparing Work Plans (including Objectives, Activities, Benchmarks, Timeline, Outcomes and Measures) ...	35
- Budget Information: How to Complete the Budget Portion of Your Grant Application.....	39
- Form 524 Section A (Budget Summary, U.S. Department of Education Funds) & Form 524 Section B (Budget Summary, Non-Federal Funds)	*
- State Applicant's <u>Eligibility Checklist</u>	43
- State Applicant's Final Checklist	45
 Assurances: Required to Receive Federal Funding	47
- Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters: and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements	*
- Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transactions	*
- Non-Construction Programs	*
- Guidance on Section 427 of GEPA for New Discretionary Grant Awards	48
 Additional Reference Information	50
- Supplemental Information	51
- Workshop Information.....	52
- Intergovernmental Review & State Single Points of Contact....	53
- Notice to Prospective Participants in Contract and Grant Programs.....	57
- Higher Education Act of 1965: Title II - Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships	*
- Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program Closing Date Notice	*
- GPRA Performance Indicators for Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants.....	59
- Currently Designated Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities	66
- Grant Application Receipt Acknowledgement.....	70

***Items starred are standard required Federal Forms. To access these required items, please go to the following web site:**

<http://ocfo.ed.gov/grantinfo/appforms.htm>

April, 2000

Dear State Applicant:

Thank you for your interest in the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program administered by the U. S. Department of Education. These grant opportunities come at a time when it is more important than ever before that we focus on the quality of our Nation's teaching force. Many of America's communities face daunting challenges as they seek to provide a high-quality education for all children that will prepare them for the 21st century. The new grant programs offer an opportunity to meet these challenges by helping to ensure that every child has the chance to learn from caring, well-prepared teachers.

The three Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Programs authorized by Title II of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 – State Grants, Partnership Grants for Improving Teacher Education, and Teacher Recruitment Grants – seek to make lasting changes in the ways we recruit, prepare, license, and support teachers. States are eligible to apply for grants under two of the Teacher Quality programs: State Grants and Teacher Recruitment Grants. Awards under both of these programs will be made for up to three years. States may also serve as secondary applicants on Partnership Grants, which are awarded for up to five years. **For Fiscal Year 2000, the Department will only hold competitions for the State and Partnership Grant Programs.**

The Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program has been allocated \$7.9 million for the State Grant Program in FY 2000. Based on last year's average awards, the Department estimates that it will make 6 State Grant awards of approximately \$1.5 million each per year.

This application package is designed for use by States to apply for FY 2000 State Grants (CFDA No. 84.336A). Application information, instructions, and forms can be found within this booklet. Please review the entire application package carefully before preparing and submitting your application. A separate application package is available for the Partnership Grants Program.

The closing date for State Grant applications will be **June 12, 2000**. Upon receipt of your application, the Department's Application Control Center will assign it an application identification number, which will be returned to you via a notification of receipt. Please refer to this number in any further correspondence concerning your application.

All applications will be reviewed and ranked by panels of experts based on the selection criteria contained in this application package. The Department requires submission of an original and two copies of an application. However, **we strongly encourage you to submit an original and five copies** since five reviewers will read each application.

In the month of April, the Department will conduct four regional technical assistance workshops to assist prospective applicants in developing applications for Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Programs. You are welcome to attend any of these sessions. More information on these workshops can be found at the Department's Teacher Quality website:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/heatqp/index.html>.

The Department anticipates that State Grant awards will be announced by August, 2000. For further information concerning this program or the application process, please use our web site at the above address. If you have a specific question, please contact our program office at:

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Postsecondary Education
Telephone: 202/502-7878
Fax: 202/502-7699
E-mail: teacherquality@ed.gov

Again, thank you for your interest and for your commitment to improving the quality of teaching in America.

Sincerely,

A. Lee Fritschler
Assistant Secretary
for Postsecondary Education

THE CHALLENGE: ENSURING A HIGH QUALITY TEACHING FORCE FOR OUR NATION'S CLASSROOMS

Teaching is the essential profession, the one that makes all other professions possible. Although higher standards for student performance, improved curricula and assessments, and safe schools have a vital place on the Nation's school reform agenda, without well-prepared, caring, and committed teachers, not even the highest standards in the world will ensure that our children are prepared for the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century.

Accordingly, what teachers know and are able to do is of critical importance. Yet we face numerous challenges to ensure a high quality teaching force throughout our nation. The increasing enrollments and accelerating teacher retirements that are expected in the coming years will lead to unprecedented hiring demands in the profession. America's schools will need to hire 2.2 million teachers over the next decade, more than half of whom will be first-time teachers. As classrooms grow more challenging and diverse, and as more students with disabilities are educated in general classrooms, these teachers will need to be well prepared to teach all students to the highest standards. Teachers need to be prepared to provide effective instruction across the full range of student abilities.

The need for greater numbers of well-prepared teachers is particularly pressing for schools in high-poverty areas. Despite this recognized need, new teachers often begin their teaching careers with too little academic background in the subjects they will teach, limited technological skills, an insufficient amount of school-based teaching experience prior to graduation and licensure. Furthermore, they generally have minimal support in their first few years of teaching from veteran teachers, school administrators, and the teacher preparation schools from which they graduated.

Contemporary classrooms and social conditions confront teachers with a range of complex challenges. These include identifying and meeting the needs of students who have difficulty adapting to the school environment and may be at-risk of violent behavior. New education goals and tougher standards, more rigorous assessments, greater interest in parental involvement, and expanded use of technology increase the knowledge and skills that teaching demands.

State licensure and certification systems often compound these problems. Some are built upon low expectations, limited accountability, and a lack of system-wide responsibility for the quality of teacher preparation, or for the results of existing licensure and certification policies. Consequently, States quite frequently do little to ensure that new teachers are well prepared to help all children succeed, including students across the range of abilities.

Although challenges such as these can be daunting, they provide an opportunity for making dramatic improvements in the ways we recruit, prepare, license, and provide on-going support for teachers. It has been nearly thirty years since the Federal government last made a major investment in teacher recruitment and preparation. The three Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Programs in Title II of the Higher Education Act give us another historic chance to effect positive change in the quality of teaching in America.

FACING THE CHALLENGE: THE TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT GRANTS PROGRAM

Each of the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant programs brings a unique approach to improving teacher education throughout our Nation. A brief description of how each program will face the challenge follows:

State Grants seek to promote statewide teacher education reform activities through the linkage of K-12 and higher education institutions and systemic policy and practice changes in areas such as:

- teacher licensing and certification;
- state and higher education accountability for high quality teacher preparation;
- improved content knowledge for subject area preparation;
- improved teaching skills;
- infusion of technology into curriculum and teaching;
- enhanced school-based clinical experiences;
- extended mentoring of new teachers;
- teacher recruitment for high-need schools;
- meaningful accountability for teacher performance; and
- high quality professional development opportunities for new and existing teachers.

Partnership Grants for Improving Teacher Education seek to promote reforms in teacher preparation by:

- strengthening the vital role of K-12 educators in the design and implementation of effective teacher education programs;
- increasing collaboration among the administrators and faculty of higher education institutions' schools of arts and sciences and education;
- developing programs that involve university- and partnership-wide commitment to improving K-12 student learning and achievement;
- producing teachers with a greater command of academic subjects, and the skills to teach them;
- immersing student teachers in intensive clinical experiences, preparing them to work with diverse student populations; and
- providing induction period support and professional development opportunities.

Teacher Recruitment Grants seek to assist in reforms at the state and local levels by:

- being vital catalysts that stimulate successful efforts to recruit highly competent teachers who agree to work in high need local education agencies (LEAs);

- supporting the efforts of the States and partnerships to reduce the shortages of *qualified* teachers so that all students, especially those in *high-need* school districts, have the teachers necessary to ensure that they can achieve to challenging content and performance standards; and
- offering alternative routes into teaching by those coming to the profession from other careers or educational backgrounds and resulting in high quality teachers entering the classroom from these nontraditional backgrounds.

State applicants are encouraged to coordinate their efforts with applicants for Partnership and Teacher Recruitment Grants in order to implement and ensure lasting, comprehensive change in teacher education.

STATE GRANTS PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The State Grants Program offers a unique opportunity to support far-reaching efforts to redesign teacher education. Through the policy leadership of Governors, State legislatures, Chief State School Officers, state higher education system heads, and all other important partners, the Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grants Program can assure the statewide support so essential to bringing about the important policy changes needed in teacher recruitment, preparation, licensing, and certification. States will be in the position to increase the expectations for newly state-certified and licensed teachers as well as test for and reward high-quality teaching. Thus, States can ensure that only teachers achieving excellence in their pedagogical and content knowledge will be teaching in our Nation's schools.

ALLOWABLE USE OF FUNDS

The State Grants Program is a competitive process. Each state may develop a program application that focuses on activities it chooses to conduct in one or more broad priority areas (see section 202(d) of the Higher Education Act); applicants will then compete against each other for funds. The critical areas on which a state may focus are:

- Teacher licensure, certification, and preparation policies and practices, including rigorous alternative routes to certification;
- Implementing reforms that hold institutions of higher education with teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing teachers who are highly competent in academic content areas and possess strong teaching skills;
- State policies and procedures that encourage wholesale redesign of teacher preparation programs, in collaboration with the schools of arts and sciences and using models that include stronger academic content in teacher education programs;
- State efforts that lead to improved linkages between higher education institutions and K-12 schools, with more time spent in K-12 classroom settings by college faculty and teacher education students and greater use of technology in the teacher education programs;
- The use of new strategies to attract, prepare, support and retain highly competent teachers in high-poverty urban and rural areas;

- The redesign and improvement of existing teacher professional development programs to improve the content knowledge, technology skills, and teaching skills of practicing teachers;
- Improved accountability for high-quality teaching through performance-based compensation and the expeditious removal of incompetent or unqualified teachers while ensuring due process; and/or
- The development and implementation of efforts to address the problem of social promotion and to prepare teachers to deal with the issues raised by ending social promotion, thereby helping all children, including students with disabilities, to succeed.

COMPONENTS OF CHANGE FOR STATE GRANT APPLICATIONS

To implement successful programs, the following elements are important in order to achieve the objectives of the Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grants Program:

- **Leadership and Partners:** Commitment from the state's chief executive and other key legislative, education and higher education leaders that these systemic policy and practice changes are top priorities—as shown by their direct involvement.
- **Systemic Change and Policy Alignment:** Coordinated activities in the state through collaboration between the state education and higher education agencies, as well as the alignment of other policy and practice activities that further the cause of comprehensive reform at the state level and speed up the pace at which these changes occur.
- **Sustainability:** Continued support of projects after federal funding ends. The demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support will be required as evidence that projects will be institutionalized.

LEADERSHIP AND PARTNERS

Effective state projects have partners. While the Governor of the State, or the agency that licenses or certifies teachers will be the lead applicant

under the Title II statute, substantial change at the state level requires the involvement of others such as:

- state higher education systems
- state K-12 systems
- community college systems
- professional standards boards
- teacher unions
- parent organizations
- business groups

State projects that focus on substantial changes to the statewide K-16 system will have key partners working together to address the teacher quality and shortage problems. High quality proposals will explain in specific ways how the partners will coordinate a broad range of activities in their state, through collaboration across the K-16 system and by the alignment of policies and practices that further comprehensive reform at the state level.

Effective projects will have real partnerships between state higher education and K-12 education systems, and with other relevant players, enabling them to create and sustain support systems for preservice students and new teachers. Applications should provide concrete evidence of continuing efforts to address the teacher quality and teacher shortage issues, with the strongest proposals being those which permanently change the ways teachers are trained and supported. Applications should include specific information about the number of prospective teachers who will be served by the project. Outcomes ought to be clear and detailed, and should result from a comprehensive and thorough approach to the issues of teacher quality and shortages. State projects should result in meaningful accountability systems for teacher preparation institutions, as well as high quality teacher assessment and licensure practices. All of these should be linked directly to the goal of improved achievement for every student.

SYSTEMIC CHANGE AND POLICY ALIGNMENT

Project goals and activities should be driven by the needs of schools and of K-12 students. Essential partners should have meaningful roles, with the project vision focused clearly on K-12 student achievement and high quality teaching. Proposals that seek significant and lasting systemic changes will lead to major improvements in the quality of teachers produced within the state. Applications should focus on the impact of the project in terms of the depth and breadth of change, how the changes will be lasting ones, and the impact on the supply of well-trained and

highly qualified teachers in the state served by the project. Proposals should offer concrete plans and implementation details on how these changes will take place and how they will be institutionalized.

Strong proposals will demonstrate a clear and consistent focus on K-12 student achievement throughout the narrative. This strong focus on student achievement should be evident in proposal discussions of state licensure and certification policies, teacher education program content, the system for providing support services to new teachers once they enter the classroom, and efforts to hold higher education institutions accountable for the quality of their programs. Peer reviewers will also look for this focus in the proposal sections on outcomes and evaluation activities.

The project focus should be on key policies and practices that result in high quality teacher preparation throughout the state. It should concentrate on permanent policies and practices that address these issues, so that when funding from Title II ends, the state will continue to produce and support high quality new teachers for its schools and their students. Proposals should provide specific details about how they will build capacity to achieve these lasting changes.

The state Teacher Quality Enhancement project should be connected with other statewide teacher quality activities through explicit policy or practice linkages and should tie all partners together in an organized manner. For states in the beginning stages of this work and seeking start-up support from Title II, proposals should demonstrate awareness of the need to build these cross-connections and offer a credible commitment to implement these linkages as the project develops. This alignment of policies and spending priorities is an essential test of the commitment to build a strong project and to sustain it beyond the Title II support period. Proposals should provide detailed evidence of their commitment to align the expenditure of their own funds to funds expended for the Title II project. This can mean, for instance, changing the priorities of existing programs so that they, in turn, address similar teacher quality efforts. This could occur through the reallocation of other federal funds, as well as the redirection of state education funding programs or of money available to the higher education partners.

SUSTAINABILITY

Projects should propose to make permanent changes within the state they seek to serve. Those funded by Title II are expected to have a credible strategy for institutionalization once federal support ends. Strong proposals will demonstrate this by describing in clear terms the steps taken to ensure that project work will not cease when federal

support is over. The proposal should clearly spell out what activities will take place once the grant is awarded to promote institutionalization beginning in Year 1 and continuing throughout the life of the project. Proposals should identify ongoing funding sources that are specifically committed to the project after the grant period, or discuss specific steps that will be taken to seek these funds. Details should be included such as: specific amounts of money; clear support from key leaders; a specific timeline to ask for or acquire money; and detailed language from partners about using their own funds to continue the project. The Teacher Quality Enhancement Program defines institutionalization in these terms:

- Project work does not stop when federal funding ends;
- The partners continue to fund the activities past the end of the grant period; and
- There is a clear and unmistakable commitment to continue implementing comprehensive programs once the grant period is over and to allocating the resources necessary to do this work successfully.

The project must commit its own resources—including funds, personnel, and time—during the three years of grant support and after grant funding has ended. Proposals should provide convincing evidence that the resources proposed as match by each of the partners reflect commitment to substantial change within each partner organization and by the state as a whole. This ought to include a demonstrated commitment by state leaders to comprehensive reform that cuts across the entire K-16 system. There should be a clear and unmistakable willingness to allocate the resources necessary to continue statewide systemic reform once the grant period is over.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT COMPONENT WITHIN A STATE GRANT APPLICATION: AN OVERVIEW

The Teacher Recruitment component of a Title II application will permit those receiving grants to address the challenge of America's teacher shortage by making significant and lasting systemic changes to the ways that teachers are recruited, prepared and supported as new teachers in high-need schools. It is the goal of Title II to see that these systemic changes lead to important improvements to the supply of well-trained and highly qualified teachers. In order to meet the Title II challenge effectively, States that choose to include teacher recruitment components in their applications are strongly encouraged to focus on several key elements as they design their projects.

Applicants should identify, with strong input from LEAs, the critical needs of the participating high-need LEAs for recruiting and preparing highly competent teachers. Specific details about the high-need districts that will be served by the project should be included in the proposal.

The LEAs should be in the same geographic area or the same state as the partner higher education institutions. There should be evidence of real partnerships between the organizations involved in the proposed project: between the higher education institutions and the schools, or between state higher education and education systems. Furthermore, evidence of the LEA commitment to hire qualified scholarship recipients ought to be clearly explained in the proposal.

The Department is particularly interested in receiving applications that focus their efforts on recruiting students from disadvantaged and underrepresented groups to become teachers in high-need LEAs and schools. The interest in applications that present this focus is due to the growing gap between the diversity of the student population and the composition of the teaching force.

Applicants should identify pools of potential teachers who can meet the LEAs' needs. Examples of successful efforts will include projects that focus on the recruitment of teachers from disadvantaged backgrounds, paraprofessionals, second career professionals, Peace Corps volunteers, retired military personnel, and teachers hired under emergency certifications or currently teaching without full certification.

The availability of scholarship assistance will be a very useful tool in attracting well-qualified individuals to become teachers in these high-need schools. Because of this, the Department is particularly interested in receiving proposals that would provide scholarship support for prospective teachers.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to design high-quality teacher preparation and induction programs that set high standards for teaching and reflect up-to-date knowledge of research and best practice known across the country. The proposal submitted to the Title II program should explain how the applicant will ensure that students enrolled in teacher preparation programs, whether receiving scholarships or not, will receive high-quality instruction in participating teacher preparation programs. Among the skills teachers should be prepared to have are to identify and assist students having difficulty adapting to the school environment who may be at-risk for violent behavior. The project should also address technology in the training of teachers. Given the rapidly changing demographics of our country and the belief that all children can achieve to high state and local content and performance standards, funded projects are expected to prepare teachers to work with diverse student populations.

The Department of Education seeks to fund projects that have credible institutionalization plans so that when Title II funding phases out, the work we have helped to start will continue and will be sustained. Project activities are expected to *improve the capacity of the participating LEA(s)* to hire and retain qualified teachers. Strong proposals will demonstrate sustainability by describing in clear terms the steps that applicants will take to continue to fund project activities past the end of the grant period.

Applicants with Teacher Recruitment components in their projects are strongly encouraged to focus on the key elements of a strong proposal outlined above. The Title II statute of the Higher Education Act (HEA) also sets out specific requirements that each applicant must address when developing its proposal. These specific HEA requirements, as well as a fuller discussion of the elements of a strong Teacher Recruitment project, are described in the ***Other Vital Program Information*** section of this guide.

EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

States will be required to submit a work plan as part of their application. The work plan should be in the application appendices and will outline objectives, activities, benchmarks, responsible parties, timelines, outcomes and measures. These items that an applicant proposes to use for each year of the grant will determine whether project activities will be effective in meeting the Title II program's overall goals.

Proposals should provide clear descriptions of these items so that reviewers can easily determine what activities will take place, who is responsible, the evidence that will show whether the project has met its objectives successfully, and by when each key objective will be achieved. There should be no doubt about where the project is going, how it will get there, and what will be done along the way to achieve project objectives.

Vague descriptions or general statements without details may be an indication that the project has trouble defining, or will have difficulty producing, tangible, important accomplishments during the funding period. Proposals that include clear objectives, benchmarks, responsible parties, timelines, outcomes and measures are more likely to be successful.

Please see the appendix to this booklet for further details on work plans and outcomes.

OTHER APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Applicants will submit an application narrative of to the equivalent of no more than 50 pages. Place the name of the applicant at the top or bottom of each page of the narrative. Each page should be numbered consecutively with the first page of the narrative listed as page 1.

Applicants must also submit a budget narrative, work plan, and evaluation plan to the equivalent of no more than 10 pages, 10 pages, and 5 pages respectively.

For the application narrative, budget narrative, work plan, and the evaluation plan, the following standards apply:

- A page is 8.5" x 11", on one side only, with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.
- Double space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text, including titles, headings, quotations, references, and captions.

- Use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).
- For tables, charts or graphs, also use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch.

Your application should not include enclosures other than those listed on the “Application Checklist for State Grants” in the back of this application package. Proposal readers will be instructed to base their ratings only on the information contained in up to the equivalent of each of the following: 50 pages of narrative, the budget, ten pages of budget narrative, ten pages of the work plan, five pages of the evaluation plan, and other limited materials listed in the application checklist. Readers will not evaluate any of the specified sections of your application that exceed the page limit if you apply these standards or exceed the equivalent of the page limit if you apply other standards.

The application must be either postmarked by **June 12, 2000** or hand-delivered to the Department's Application Control Center by 4:30 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on this date.

SELECTION CRITERIA FOR STATE GRANT PROGRAM APPLICATIONS

Once applications have been submitted, a panel of five peer reviewers will read and score them. Panels will determine which applications are of sufficiently high quality to recommend for funding by applying the State Program Selection Criteria. It is important therefore, that applicants write and organize their proposals according to the Selection Criteria provided below.

The Secretary will select for funding those applications that are of highest overall quality. In determining which applications to recommend for award, peer reviewers will assign each application up to 115 points using the following Selection Criteria and competitive preference. The applicant should prepare the narrative to respond to the Selection Criteria in the order in which they are listed. Selection criteria related to teacher recruitment activities are added in brackets for those applicants whose state grant proposal will include a teacher recruitment component. These applications must also address the main selection criteria, and they will be scored on how well they respond to the state teacher quality and teacher recruitment components of the Title II program.

The relative weights for each of the first four scoring sections and the individual weighted selection criteria within each will be used by the peer reviewers to assign an overall score to each application. The fifth scoring section provides a statutory competitive preference whereby an applicant may earn up to an additional 15 points.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <i>1. Quality of Project Design</i> | <i>(40 total points)</i> |
| <i>2. Significance</i> | <i>(30 total points)</i> |
| <i>3. Quality of Resources</i> | <i>(15 total points)</i> |
| <i>4. Quality of Management Plan</i> | <i>(15 total points)</i> |
| <i>5. Statutory Provision/Competitive Preference</i> | <i>(15 total points)</i> |
| <i>Preference for Empowerment Zones
and Enterprise Communities</i> | <i>(tie breaker)</i> |

DETAILED SELECTION CRITERIA

1. Quality of Project Design (40 total points)

- A. The extent to which the project design will result in systemic change in the way that all new teachers are prepared and includes partners from all levels of the education system.

[Applicants whose proposals contain a Teacher Recruitment component should also address systemic changes in the ways that new teachers are recruited, supported and prepared.]

10 points

- B. Whether the Governor and other relevant executive and legislative branch officials, the K-16 education system(s) and the business community are directly involved in and committed to supporting the proposed activities.

8 points

- C. Whether project goals and performance objectives are clear, measurable outcomes are specified, and a feasible plan is presented for meeting them.

8 points

- D. The likelihood that the project will initiate or enhance and supplement systemic State reforms in teacher recruitment, preparation, licensing, and certification.

[Applicants whose proposals contain a Teacher Recruitment component should also address systemic efforts to recruit, support and prepare prospective teachers from disadvantaged backgrounds.]

6 points

- E. The extent to which the State applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives is incorporated into operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, employers, academic and professional groups, and other appropriate entities.

4 points

- F. Whether the project design is based on up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

4 points

2. Significance

(30 total points)

- A. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies or exceptional approaches in the way new teachers are recruited, prepared, certified, and licensed.

6 points

- B. Project outcomes that lead directly to improvements in teaching quality and student achievement as measured against rigorous academic standards.

8 points

- C. Substantial evidence that the State has specific plans to institutionalize the project after federal funding ends.

[Applicants whose proposals contain a Teacher Recruitment component should also address continued recruitment, scholarship assistance, preparation and support of additional cohorts of new teachers.]

12 points

- D. Whether project strategies, methods, and accomplishments are replicable so that other states may benefit from them.

4 points

3. Quality of Resources

(15 total points)

- A. Support available to the project, including personnel, equipment, supplies, and other resources is sufficient to ensure a successful project.

[Applicants whose proposals contain a Teacher Recruitment component should also address the amount of scholarship assistance for students from federal and non-federal funds, the number of students who will receive scholarships, and how those students will benefit from high quality teacher preparation and an effective support system during their first three years of teaching.]

5 points

- B. Budget costs that are reasonable and justified in relation to the design, outcomes and potential significance of the project.

5 points

- C. The extent to which the applicant's matching share of the budget costs demonstrates a significant commitment to successful

completion of the project and to project continuation after federal funding ends.

5 points

4. Quality of Management Plan

(15 total points)

- A. The extent to which the management plan, including the work plan, is designed to achieve the goals and objectives of the project, and includes clearly defined activities, responsibilities, timelines, milestones and measurable outcomes for accomplishing project tasks.

8 points

- B. The adequacy of procedures to ensure feedback and continuous improvements in the operation of the proposed project.

3 points

- C. The qualifications, including training and experience, of key personnel charged with implementing the project successfully.

4 points

5. Statutory Provision/Competitive Preference

(15 total points)

The Secretary determines the extent to which the state's proposed activities in any one or more of the following statutory priorities are likely to yield successful and sustained results. Applications can receive up to 15 points on any one of these items. Proposals do not need to address all three priorities in order to obtain 15 points.

1. Initiatives to reform State teacher licensure and certification requirements so that current and future teachers possess strong teaching skills and academic content knowledge in the subject areas they will be certified or licensed to teach;
2. Innovative reforms to hold higher education institutions with teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing teachers who are highly competent in the academic content areas and have strong teaching skills; and/or
3. Innovative efforts to reduce the shortage (including the high turnover) of highly competent teachers in high-poverty urban and rural areas.

**Preference for Empowerment Zones
and Enterprise Communities**

(tie breaker)

In the event that the peer reviewers' use of these Selection Criteria results in an equal ranking among two or more applicants **for the last available award**, the Department will select the applicant whose activities will focus (or have most impact) on LEAs and schools located in one (or more) of the Nation's Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. Therefore, states that propose specific project activities to benefit LEAs and schools in an Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community should identify this fact in the appendices to their applications.

OTHER VITAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

1. Who is eligible to apply for State Grants (Fiscal Agent)?

According to section 103(16) of the HEA which defines the term “State,” any of the following entities may apply for a State Grant: the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Freely Associated States (the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau).

2. Who is required to be the Lead Applicant?

State Grants Program applications must come from the Governor or that individual, entity, or agency which the State constitution or law designates to be responsible for teacher certification and preparation activity. If there is more than one entity responsible for these two activities, the proposal must be submitted jointly. In these cases, the Governor’s support may be pivotal to assuring the necessary leadership for the reform efforts. When the Governor is not the lead applicant, it is the applicant’s responsibility to provide information that clearly states the lawfully designated individual, entity or agency responsible for these areas. See section Section 202(b) and (d) of the HEA.

3. What is the maximum project period and amount of funding for which States may apply?

Each State may propose activities for a project period of up to three years. The Department anticipates that for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2000 competition, approximately \$7.9 million will be available for State Grant awards and that the maximum amount available for any single award will be \$2,000,000 per year. The Department also anticipates that it will award six State Program grants, in amounts ranging from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 million per year.

One Time Award: By law (Section 205(a)(2) of the HEA), States may receive only one three-year grant award under the State Grants program.

4. What are the State’s matching requirements?

By law (section 205(c)(1) of the HEA), any State receiving a grant must contribute, from non-Federal sources, an amount equal to 50% of the yearly grant award to carry out project activities. This contribution may be in cash or in kind.

Regarding In-Kind or In Cash Contributions from States:

This non-Federal contribution from States can be either in cash or in-kind; however, peer reviewers may consider that a substantial cash match demonstrates a stronger commitment to institutionalization than matches which contain a substantial portion of in-kind contributions. Because readers are likely to respond positively to a match that exceeds the minimum statutory requirement detailed in the previous paragraph, thereby positively affecting a proposal score, applicants will be held to the match percentage that they initially propose in their applications.

5. What are the requirements to describe annual project activities?

As applicants respond to the State Selection Criteria, section 75.112 of the Education Department's General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) requires them to include both the time period for each year of the project and provide "a project narrative that describes how and when, in each budget period of the project, the applicant plans to meet each objective of the project" (emphasis added). This "time line" information should be included as part of the work plan that will be submitted with the appendix materials. It may be in chart form, but it is still subject to the 12 point font-type and double-space guidelines of the full proposal.

6. What are the Title II Statutory Requirements for a Teacher Recruitment component within a State application?

The Title II statute of the Higher Education Act (HEA) sets out specific requirements that each applicant must address when developing its proposal for Teacher Recruitment funds. These specific requirements are listed below.

1. How the Partnership or State, and any others with which they will carry out grant activities, have determined the most critical teaching needs of the participating high-need LEA(s).
2. What activities will be carried out to meet these critical needs;

When addressing the project activities that must be implemented, by law every applicant that receives a Teacher recruitment program grant must either include the three items in (A-C) or ensure that they meet the requirements of (D).

A. Provide scholarships to help students pay the costs of tuition, room, board, and other expenses of completing a teacher preparation program;

B. Provide support services (which may include academic advice and counseling, tutorial services, mentoring, child care, and transportation) that scholarship recipients need to complete postsecondary education programs; and

C. Provide follow-up services to former scholarship recipients during their first three years of teaching.

or

D. Develop and implement effective mechanisms to ensure that LEAs and their high-need schools are able to effectively recruit highly qualified teachers.

3. How the applicant meets eligibility requirements; and
4. The plan for institutionalizing grant activities once Federal funding ceases.

Where States or partnerships provide scholarship assistance, they determine the funding level and number of scholarships according to project goals and student needs.

7. What are the key elements of a Teacher Recruitment component within a State application?

Applicants with Teacher Recruitment components in their projects are strongly encouraged to focus on the following key elements in designing their applications. It is acknowledged that there is some overlap between the above statute requirements and the program elements detailed below. The key elements are drawn from the statute and from the experience of soliciting and selecting awardees in the first round of the Title II grant competition.

A. Applicants should identify, with strong input from the LEAs, the critical needs of the participating high-need LEAs for recruiting and preparing highly competent teachers, and provide specific details about the high-need districts that will be served.

These details should include such information as teacher turnover rates; shortages in specific discipline and geographic areas; mismatches between student demographic distribution and demographics of the teaching force in a school, district or state; and numbers of teachers with emergency certificates or who teach out of field.

The Department is particularly interested in receiving applications that focus their efforts on recruiting students from disadvantaged and underrepresented groups to become teachers in high-need LEAs and schools. The interest in applications that present this focus is due to the growing gap between the diversity of the student population and the composition of the teaching force.

The LEAs should be in the same geographic area or the same state as the partner higher education institutions, and there should be evidence of real partnerships between the organizations involved in the proposed project: between the higher education institutions and the schools, or between state higher education and education systems. Furthermore, there should be evidence of the LEA commitment to hire qualified scholarship recipients. The proposal should document the need for teachers in shortage areas in the participating districts, and explain why project activities are expected to **increase** the number of students at participating institutions preparing to teach in high-need school districts. It should also describe how teacher recruitment activities will enhance or supplement any existing efforts the applicant has in place to recruit competent teachers to teach and remain in high need LEAs and schools.

If applicable to the project design, the proposal should also discuss commitments by partner school districts, and school districts participating in a State project, to hire qualified scholarship recipients for positions at their high-need schools. The proposed project should result in permanent policies and practices that address the shortage of qualified teachers so that when Title II funding ends, the funded applicant will continue to produce and support new teachers for these high-need districts. Proposals should also provide **specific details** about how they will build capacity to achieve these lasting changes.

B. Applicants should identify pools of potential teachers who can meet the LEAs' needs. Examples of successful efforts will include projects that focus on: the recruitment of teachers from disadvantaged backgrounds, paraprofessionals, second career professionals, Peace Corps volunteers, retired military personnel, and teachers hired under emergency certifications or currently teaching without full certification.

C. Third, new teachers ought to be recruited from these pools through organized, well-designed outreach efforts. The proposal should describe recruitment and outreach efforts that will be used to publicize the availability of scholarships and other assistance that enable students to enroll in and complete the program. These efforts should demonstrate the use of promising existing strategies or new strategies for teacher recruitment and should include the publicizing of Teacher Recruitment scholarships and other assistance that enable students to enroll in and complete the program. These scholarships can be flexible

for full- or part-time students. They can be funded through Title II or through one or more of the partners, and should be targeted to students from disadvantaged or underrepresented groups.

Because the availability of scholarship assistance will be a very useful tool in attracting well-qualified individuals to become teachers in these high-need schools, the Secretary is particularly interested in receiving proposals that would provide scholarship support for prospective teachers.

Recruitment efforts should also publicize the program's academic and student support services such as mentoring, tutoring, quality faculty advising, cohort groups, work-study or summer internships, and other needed services. The proposal should discuss the criteria to be used in selecting the students, including how the partnership or State will determine whether individuals have the capacity to benefit from the program, complete teacher certification requirements, and become effective teachers. Strong proposals will offer evidence of commitment to disseminate effective teacher recruitment practices to others and to provide technical assistance to other educational entities.

D. Applicants are strongly encouraged to design high-quality teacher preparation and induction programs that set high standards for teaching and reflect the best research and practice known across the country. The proposal submitted to the Title II program should explain how the applicant will ensure that students enrolled in teacher preparation programs, whether receiving scholarships or not, will receive high-quality instruction in participating teacher preparation programs. These programs should include improved subject matter content knowledge and teaching skills so that teachers are well prepared to teach the subjects they will be hired to teach. Such preparation will require collaboration on the college campus between the school of arts and science and the school of education. The project should also address technology in the training of teachers to enable them to integrate technology into curriculum and instruction, as this is so essential to meeting the needs and demands of the 21st century.

Given the rapidly changing demographics of our country and the belief that all children can achieve to high state and local content and performance standards, funded projects are expected to prepare teachers to work with diverse student populations. Identifying and meeting the needs of students who have difficulty adapting to the school environment and may be at-risk for violent behavior is one of the most serious current challenges facing our schools. To deal with these and other classroom issues, strong teacher preparation programs will immerse student teachers in intensive, well-designed and extensive clinical experiences so

that the issues and challenges of effective teaching are not surprises to them when they enter the profession as new teachers.

Teacher Recruitment components of funded Title II projects should provide carefully structured supportive experiences for new teachers once they enter the classroom. Proposals should be specific in describing how the project will facilitate the successful transition of the students from their teacher preparation experience into the experience of teaching in high-need schools. Examples of allowable activities include induction period support mentoring, organized professional development activities, program “guarantees” of graduate readiness, university faculty working in the schools with new teachers, and customized assistance to help new teachers overcome challenges. These activities, among others, should all be used as tools to produce effective, successful teachers who can meet the needs of every student, and thus, improve student achievement in the K-12 schools. Projects which propose to develop and implement alternative routes into teaching by those coming to the profession from other careers or educational backgrounds should also address the issues outlined above to ensure that high quality teachers are produced by alternative route programs.

E. The Department of Education seeks to fund projects that have credible institutionalization plans so that when Title II funding phases out, the work we have helped to start will continue and will be sustained. Project activities are expected to *improve the capacity of the participating LEA(s)* to hire and retain qualified teachers. Strong proposals will demonstrate sustainability by describing in clear terms the steps that applicants will take to continue to fund project activities past the end of the grant period. Such proposals will identify ongoing funding sources that are specifically committed to the project after the grant period, or they will discuss specific steps that will be taken to seek these funds. It should be quite clear to reviewers that there will be successive cohorts of prospective teachers recruited into the program during and after the grant period, and that each cohort will be provided with the same high quality program and support services. The applicant’s matching share will be a strong indicator of the program’s commitment to successfully implement the project, and to continue proposed activities after federal funding ends.

F. Applicants are encouraged to develop innovative, high-quality routes to teaching and to coordinate their activities with State governors, boards of education, higher education, including community colleges, and professional standards, State education and higher education agencies and institutions of higher education. All projects should have an effective, inclusive, and responsive governance and decision-making structure that will permit all

members of the project, including K-12 teachers and administrators, to plan, implement, and assess the adequacy of project activities. Projects should also draw upon a wide array of community resources. Examples of these resources include, but are not limited to, teacher organizations, businesses and community groups in order to enhance project success.

G. Applicants should provide a management plan that includes a carefully designed set of project goals and objectives that can be achieved within the proposed budget, as well as clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. Applicants should describe the evaluative procedures that would ensure feedback and continuous improvements in the operations of the proposed project. It is also important to show that the budget costs are justifiable, allowable and reasonable in relation to the design and potential significance of the program activities.

8. What is the administrative cost percentage required for State Grant applicants?

Section 205(d) of the HEA limits the amount of grant funds that a State or partnership receiving any Teacher Quality Enhancement Program grant award may use to administer the grant to two percent of the award. Moreover, this two-percent limitation applies to the total of funds charged for administration, whether as direct or indirect costs.

9. How does the two percent administrative cost requirement affect the costs of data collection and preparation of public reporting and evaluations?

The costs of data collection and preparation of public reporting and evaluation can come out of the 98 percent of funds reserved for program activities. Preparation of these reports and evaluations are closely connected to the specific aspects of the program, and so they are not considered "administrative" activities.

10. What is the allowable indirect cost rate for the State Grant Program?

By law (Section 611.41 of Title II Program Regulations), the indirect cost rate for a State Grant Recipient is limited to eight percent or the amount permitted by its negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, *whichever is less*. Recipients must include an estimate of the annual amount of indirect costs to be charged to grant funds on the multiyear budget forms they submit as part of their program applications. Unrecovered indirect costs **cannot** be used to match grant funds.

11. How are projects funded at different stages of development?

The Department anticipates funding State Program projects at different stages of development. Some projects may be completely new because the state is beginning the process of identifying the systemic policy and practice changes needed to ensure that every child in the K-12 system has a high quality teacher, with these states in need of start-up costs in the first year and more substantial support in subsequent years. Other projects may reflect an expansion of State activities, with enhanced goals and activities that fit well with Title II program objectives. To accommodate this range of State Program projects, the Department expects that some projects will request funding that increases over time, from start-up expenses in the first year to a higher level of support in the following years. At the same time, the Department expects that proposals reflecting more mature projects might request substantial funding in the first year with a gradual decrease in later years as the State institutionalizes its activities and resource base.

12. What are the State requirements for promoting awareness of project success?

The Secretary expects that all those awarded grants will maintain a sustained and substantive dialogue with the Department, interested organizations across the education spectrum, and the public about the progress they are making. Therefore, along with other means of maintaining dialogue, the Department will ask all recipients of State Program grant awards to plan, and budget, for at least two three-day meetings per year with Department staff and other grantees to discuss the progress of their projects. Additionally, States grant recipients are expected to make presentations on their activities at important regional and national meetings and conferences. To make it easier to share information on the progress that State grantees are making in achieving their objectives, their applications need to identify a single point-of-contact.

13. What reporting requirements does the Higher Education Act impose on States receiving grants under the State Grants Program?

The Department requires all recipients of Teacher Quality Enhancement Program grant awards to submit a satisfactory annual performance report as a condition of receiving a continuation award. Additionally, Teacher Quality grant recipients must maintain certain baseline and other data that the Department will identify and use for the Congressionally-mandated national evaluation of the Title II programs and to meet its own reporting requirements to Congress. The

Department is working to integrate the above requirements with the reporting requirements of section 206(a) described below, in order to limit the number of performance reports grantees would be required to submit to one per year.

A State that receives a grant award under the State Grants Program must submit, annually, a ***State Grant Accountability Report*** to the Secretary, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives. As explained more fully in section 206(a) of the HEA, this report must contain a description of the degree to which the State, in using State Program funds, has made substantial progress in meeting the following goals:

- a. Increasing student achievement,
- b. Raising standards to enter the teaching profession,
- c. Increasing the pass rate for initial certification or licensure (or numbers of persons certified or licensed through alternative programs);
- d. Increasing the percentage of teachers who have adequate content knowledge in the subjects they are teaching;
- e. Decreasing teacher shortages;
- f. Increasing Opportunities for Professional Development; and
- g. Increasing the number of teachers prepared to integrate technology into the classroom.

In view of these statutory requirements, the Department is not requiring recipients of State Program grant awards to submit an end-of-project program evaluation that EDGAR would otherwise require.

Sections 207-209 of the HEA contain other reporting and accountability requirements for any State that receives funds under the HEA (not simply under Title II). These include a requirement for a State “report card” on the quality of its teacher preparation programs (section 207(a)-(c)). They also include a requirement that, by October 2001, the State have in place (1) a procedure to identify and assist low performing teacher preparation programs within institutions of higher education and (2) provisions that institutions for which the State has withdrawn its approval or terminated its financial support because of the poor performance of their teacher preparation programs must lose their eligibility for HEA and other Federal professional development funding.

14. How do grant recipients request funding for the second and third years of their projects, and what information will

recipients need to provide the Department to be eligible for subsequent year funding?

Sections 75.112 and 75.117 of EDGAR contain certain general requirements for all applications to the Department for multiyear awards. Applicants should note that section 75.112(b) requires the project application to include a narrative that describes how and when, in each budget period of the project, the applicant plans to meet each project objective. In addition, section 75.117(b) requires submission of a budget narrative and form that includes budget information for each budget year of the proposed project.

Sections 75.118 and 75.253 of EDGAR contain requirements for receipt of a continuation award. In order to receive an award for a succeeding year of the project, a recipient must submit an adequate report on project performance to date. This report contains performance and financial expenditure information that enables the Secretary to determine whether the partnership is making substantial progress toward meeting the year-to-year objectives contained in its approved application.

Those receiving Teacher Quality grants will receive more information on the desired content and submission dates of these performance reports.

Section 206(c)(2) of the HEA provides that a State Program grantee's failure to make substantial progress in meeting its purposes, goals, objectives, and measures by the end of the second year of the grant period will result in discontinuation of its grant after the second year.

15. What is the requirement for scholarship recipients to repay scholarship money?

By law (Section 611.41-52 of Title II Program Regulations), all recipients of scholarships provided with Federal funds under the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program will be required to repay scholarships if they do not teach in high-need local education agencies for the period of time that is equivalent to the period for which they received scholarship assistance.

Instructions And Forms

Teacher Quality Enhancement Program Intent to Submit Application

Type of Grant:

- ☒ **State**
- ☐ **Partnership**
- ☐ **Teacher Recruitment**

The Department will use an outside peer review process to evaluate applications for its Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Programs, and to identify applications to be recommended for award. The quality of that process will depend, in part, on the Department's ability to secure an appropriate number of reviewers, accommodations for them, and space in which they will work. The Department's ability to do this will depend, in turn, upon advance knowledge of the approximate number of applications it will receive.

For this reason, if your State intends to apply for funding under the State Grant Program, we ask that you provide the Department with the following information:

Name of (Primary) Applicant Institution: _____

Contact Name, Title, and Office: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip Code: _____

Telephone: _____

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Please return this form on or before May 5, 2000, to:

Brenda Shade
Teacher Quality Grant Programs
U.S. Department of Education
1990 K Street, N.W.
Room 6148
Washington, DC 20006-8525
Fax: 202/502-7699
E-mail: teacherquality@ed.gov.

The Department will use this information for planning purposes only. It will not be used in the review of your application. If you inform the Department of your intent to apply but subsequently decide not to do so, please notify the Department accordingly.

STATE GRANTS PROGRAM APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Application Deadline and Procedures

The deadline for submission of applications for the ***State Grants Program*** is **June 12, 2000**. All applications must be postmarked or hand-delivered on or before the deadline date. This closing date and the following procedures for guaranteeing timely submission will be strictly observed.

The Department requires applicants to submit one original signed and two copies of the application. However, because five reviewers will read each application, we strongly encourage you to submit an original and five copies of the State application.

Applicants will submit an application narrative to the equivalent of no more than 50 pages. Place the name of the applicant at the top or bottom of each page of the narrative. Each page should be numbered consecutively with the first page of the narrative listed as page 1.

Applicants must also submit a budget narrative, work plan, and evaluation plan to the equivalent of no more than 10 pages, 10 pages, and 5 pages respectively.

For the application narrative, budget narrative, work plan, and the evaluation plan, the following standards apply:

- A page is 8.5" x 11", on one side only, with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.
- Double space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text, including titles, headings, quotations, references, and captions.
- Use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).
- For tables, charts or graphs, also use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch.

Your application should not include enclosures other than those listed on the "State Applicant's Final Checklist" in the back of this application package. Proposal readers will be instructed to base their ratings only on the information contained in up to the equivalent of each of the following: 50 pages of narrative, the budget, ten pages of budget narrative, ten pages of the work plan, five pages of the evaluation plan, and other

limited materials listed in the application checklist. Readers will not evaluate any of the specified sections of your application that exceed the page limit if you apply these standards or exceed the equivalent of the page limit if you apply other standards.

Applications Sent by Mail

Applications should be mailed on or before the deadline date to the:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center -- Room 3633
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants
Attention: CFDA 84.336A
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202-4725
Telephone: (202) 708-9493

Applications must show one of the following as proof of mailing:

1. A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service Postmark;
2. A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service;
3. A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier;
or
4. Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

If an application is sent through the U.S. Postal Service, the Secretary does not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:

1. A private metered postmark; or
2. A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.

Applicants are encouraged to use registered mail or at least first class mail. In addition, an applicant should note that the U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, an applicant should check with its local post office.

Each late applicant will be notified that its application will not be considered.

Applications Delivered by Hand

Hand-delivered applications must be received by 4:30 p.m. on or before the deadline date to the:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants
Attn: CFDA 84.336A
Room 3633
Regional Office Building No. 3
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202-4725
Telephone: (202) 708-9493

The Application Control Center accepts application deliveries daily between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (Washington, DC time), except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays. The Center accepts application deliveries through the D Street entrance only. A person delivering an application must show identification to enter the building.

DUNS NUMBER INSTRUCTIONS

You will need to provide your D-U-N-S (Data Universal Numbering System) number on ED Form 424 as part of your application package. If your organization does not have a D-U-N-S number, you may obtain one at no charge by contacting Dun & Bradstreet at 1-800-333-0505 to request a D-U-N-S Number Request Form. Forms are also available on their website at:

<http://www.dnb.com/dbis/aboutdb/intlduns.html>

Dun & Bradstreet, a global information services provider, has assigned D-U-N-S Numbers to over 43 million organizations worldwide.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING PROJECT WORK PLANS

The state proposal should include a work plan in the appendix that outlines objectives, activities, benchmarks, responsible parties, time lines, outcomes, and measures.

The work plan must be limited to the equivalent of no more than ten pages in length and double-spaced, and all information—including tables—must be presented in a font that is either 12-point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).

Activities should include specific steps to develop and implement a strong project. Details should also be provided regarding which partner will be responsible for which activities. Outcomes should be specific and measurable.

Proposals should provide clear descriptions of these items so that reviewers can easily determine what activities will take place, the evidence that will show whether the project has met its objectives successfully, and by when each key objective will be achieved. There should be no doubt about where the project is going, how it will get there, and what will be done along the way to achieve project objectives. Vague descriptions or general statements without details may be an indication that the project will have difficulty producing tangible, important accomplishments during the funding period. Proposals that include clear objectives, benchmarks, responsible parties, time lines, measures, and outcomes are more likely to be successful.

The Teacher Quality Enhancement Program defines an outcome as something important that occurs as a result of the work that takes place. Outcomes should be more than process-type activities or events. They should be the result of a set of project activities and project expenditures, which means that the work plan and the budget are tools used to produce a set of important outcomes. In addition, each outcome must be measurable in one or more ways, so the proposal should describe what evidence will be used to determine and measure success.

The number of objectives in each work plan should be tied to the number of project goals. Every activity and benchmark does not need its own outcome, but each project objective should have an outcome.

For State proposals, for example, if the goal is a stronger licensure system, an outcome would be teachers having the knowledge and skills expected under the state's teacher standards and licensing system. For applications that include a teacher recruitment component, outcomes

should include, but are not limited to: the number of students recruited and retained; the knowledge levels and teaching skills of the preservice students; and how many teachers are hired and retained by the high-need local school district partner.

The key outcome for the Title II program itself is production of well-qualified and successful new teachers equipped with the knowledge and skills to improve K-12 student achievement in the United States.

Funded projects must have measurable outcomes compatible with this overall program outcome. Items such as number of courses redesigned are benchmarks on the way to this outcome. Items such as meetings, conferences, etc., are not outcomes and are not even benchmarks, they are activities toward meeting a benchmark such as redesigning the math curriculum or toward reaching an outcome like graduating new math teachers fully prepared to be successful.

In every case of an outcome, the proposal should describe what evidence will be used to measure progress or success.

DEFINITIONS:

Objective—A specific aim, the achievement of which contributes to the attainment of the program's goal. Examples include: to assure that low-income students are aware of financial aid programs for which they are eligible.

Activities—The work performed by the applicant that directly produces the core products and services. Examples include: training given, counseling provided, conferences held, reports published, class hours conducted.

Benchmarks—Comparative standards for evaluating accomplishments against known exemplars of excellence. A benchmark is a targeted goal that is beyond current capabilities, but for which the applicant is striving. Examples include: all participants will have received a minimum of four academic advising contacts per semester, increase in internship opportunities for student teachers.

Timeline—The dates when benchmarks will be accomplished. For example: March 2001.

Responsible Party—The entity responsible for accomplishing the benchmark. For example: Project Director, Arts & Sciences faculty, LEA Liaison.

Outcomes—Outcomes are accomplishments of program objectives attributable to program outputs. Both intermediate and long-term outcomes can be identified, measured and evaluated. Intermediate outcomes are useful to assess early results when key goals will not be achieved for several years. The outcome should answer the following questions: What will the impact be? What will happen that can be measured? Examples of outcomes include: academic performance improvement, students accepted at the next level of education, (as an outcome of the previous level), graduates certified as teachers, job performance or employer satisfaction.

Note: Sometimes, outputs are mistaken for outcomes. In order to draw a distinction between the two, outputs are defined as follows:

Outputs—*The direct results of program activities. Outputs are useful in defining what a program produces, but an output is not an outcome. Outputs are limited because they do not indicate whether program or project goals have been accomplished, and they do not provide information on the quality and efficiency of the service provided. Examples include: the number of courses redesigned, targeted students completing training, students applying to next level of education.*

FURTHER EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE OUTCOMES:

- Producing teachers with stronger content knowledge in the subject they teach.
- New teachers with strong teaching skills.
- Producing teachers able to use technology effectively in curriculum and instructional practices.
- Reduced teacher turnover or improved retention of new teachers.

Outcome Measures—An assessment of the results, effects or impact of a program activity compared to its intended purpose. Measures are characteristics or metrics that can be used to assess performance aspects of a program or project. Outcome measures address the results achieved by an organization and the extent to which objectives have been achieved. Program managers, policy makers and customers are interested in outcome measures because they are indicative of the success of an organization or a program in meeting the needs of customers. Examples include: results of a test that measures skills and knowledge, grade point average, number of teachers placed successfully, percentage of new teachers retained.

Below is an example format of how to organize and display the information in your work plan. The objective in this example was chosen only to illustrate the presentation format. Applicants may use this format, or one of their own design, but please note that these are the kinds of details and measurable outcomes that peer readers and the Program Office expect to see:

EXAMPLE OF WORK PLAN FORMAT:

Objective: Teachers and students will become more computer literate.

Activities	Benchmarks	Timeline	Responsible Party
Buying new computers for each classroom.	Teacher and student computer ratios school wide will be 4:1 and 6:1.	November 1999	Head of Audio-Visual Services
Computer classes for teachers.	50% of teachers will have had technology training.	February 2000	Vice Principal
Teachers will redesign curricula to include technology lessons.	All trained teachers will have at least 25 percent of lessons incorporating technology.	April 2000	Classroom teachers
Students will actively use computers for projects and assignments.	All students will use computers at school at least 4 hours per week.	March 2000	Classroom teachers

Outcome: After Year 1, at least 75% of teachers and students will display at least an intermediate level of computer literacy.

Measure: Student and teacher results from a skills test requiring performance of various tasks on a computer.

BUDGET INFORMATION: HOW TO COMPLETE THE BUDGET PORTION OF YOUR GRANT APPLICATION

In order to be considered for federal funding each applicant must provide the following:

- ED Form 524 section A
- ED Form 524 Section B
- A descriptive budget narrative explaining the requested federal amounts for individual cost categories (double-spaced, 12 point font).

A descriptive budget narrative outlining cash and/or in-kind match contributions for individual cost categories (double-spaced, 12 point font).

ED FORM 524

ED Form 524 Section A is used to apply to individual US Department of Education discretionary grant programs. All applicants must complete Section A.

ED Form 524 Section B is used to show matching funds from other non-Federal resources or their in-kind equivalent to the project. All applicants must complete Section B.

INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE ED FORM 524

Name: Enter the Name of the organization or institution in the blank space provided.

Personnel (line 1): Enter project personnel salaries and wages only. Fee and expenses for consultants should be included on line 6. ***Note:*** Administrative costs should not exceed two percent of the total cost of the project.

Fringe Benefits (line 2): The institutions normal fringe benefit contribution may be charge to the program. If the benefits exceed twenty-eight percent (28%), an explanation and justification must be provided. Leave this line blank if fringe benefits applicable to direct salaries and wages are treated as part of the indirect cost.

Travel (line 3): Indicate the travel costs of employees and participants only. Travel of consultants, trainees, etc. should be included on line 6. ***Note:*** Include travel funds for two project staff personnel to attend two (3 day) conferences in Washington DC.

Equipment (line 4): Indicate the cost of non-expendable personal property which has a usefulness of greater than one year and acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. Lower limits may be established to maintain consistency with the applicant's policy.

Supplies (line 5): Show all tangible personal property except that which is included on line 4.

Contractual (line 6): Include consultant travel costs and fees.

Contractual (line 7): Not applicable

Other (line 8): Indicate all direct costs not covered on lines 1-6. Examples are equipment rental, required fees, communication costs, utilities, or printing costs.

Total Direct Costs (line 9): The sum of lines 1-8.

Indirect Costs (line 10): Indirect costs are limited to eighth percent (8%) of the total direct cost base (line 9).

Training Stipends (line 11): Indicate the level of awards given to participants either in the form of stipends (non-repayable) or in the form of scholarships (repayable).

Total Cost (line 12): This should equal the sum of lines 9-11 (total direct costs + indirect + stipends). The sum for column one, labeled *Project Year 1 (a)*, should also be equal to item 13a on the application face sheet (ED Form 424).

DETAILED BUDGET NARRATIVE

Each applicant must provide a budget narrative for requested federal funds and match contributions **for each program year**. You must limit your budget narrative to the equivalent of no more than 10 double-spaced pages, using a font that is either 12-point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).

The budget narrative for requested federal funds should provide the justification of how money requested per budget category is intended to be spent.

A narrative must also be provided to describe cash or in-kind match contributions per budget category. The narrative must be more than a spreadsheet. It must explain the source and expected use of federal and matching funds by budget category.

The budget narrative provides an opportunity for the applicant to identify the proposed expenditure and the amount of the proposed expenditure. There should be enough detail to enable proposal readers and project staff to understand what funds will be used for, how much will be expended, the source of funds to be expended, and the relationship between expended funds and project activities and outcomes. Applicants' narratives should contain the following information:

Personnel

- Provide the title of each position.
- Provide the salary for each position.
- Provide the amount of time each person will devote to the project.
- Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project.

Fringe Benefits

- Give the fringe benefit percentages of all personnel in the project.

Travel

- Provide the name of the personnel position(s) who will be traveling.
- Explain the purpose of the travel and how it relates to project success.
- Identify the travel destination.
- Give the individual costs related to the travel (per diem, hotel, airfare, ground transportation, mileage).

Equipment

- Identify each type of equipment.
- Provide the cost per equipment item.
- Explain the purpose of the equipment, and how it relates to project success.

Supplies

- Identify the type of supplies by general category (e.g. office supplies, instructional booklets, etc.).
- Provide the purpose for the purchasing of the supplies.

Contractual

- Identify the name(s) of the contracting party.
- Provide the cost per contractor(s).
- Provide the amount of time that the project will be working with the contractor(s).
- Provide the purpose and relation to project success.

Construction

No costs allowed.

Other Direct Costs

- Identify each type of cost in the *Other* category (e.g. communications, printing, postage, equipment rental).
- Provide the cost per item (printing=\$500, postage=\$750).
- Provide the purpose for the expenditures and relation to project success.

Total Direct Costs

The amount that is the sum of expenditures per lines 1-8 budget categories.

Indirect Costs

No more than 8% of the total direct cost amount.

Training Stipends (Scholarships)

- Identify the person(s) who will benefit from a scholarship/stipend.
- Provide the purpose of the stipend/scholarship award.
- Identify the cost per scholarship/stipend.
- Explain the importance of the scholarship/stipend to the success of the project.

Matching Funds Budget Narrative

The same detailed information must be provided for your project's cash and/or inkind contributions. The level of match your project must provide is outlined below

Grant Type	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
State grant and Teacher Recruitment	50% match	50% match	50% match

Grant Type	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five
Partnership	25% match	35% match	50% match	50% match	50% match

An applicant can provide more than the minimum match required by the law, however; if an applicant exceeds the minimum match percent and is awarded federal funds, the applicant will be required to match federal funds awarded by the original match percentage.

STATE APPLICANTS
U.S Department of Education
State Grants
Eligibility Checklist

1. APPLICANT(S): Check *ONE OR MORE* of the following

- ☐ Office of Governor _____, state of _____
- ☐ Individual, entity, or agency designated by law to be responsible for teacher preparation and certification for the State of _____. Please state the individual, entity, or agency's name: _____

2. STATUTORY PRIORITIES: Check *ONE OR MORE* of the following

This application proposes one or more of the following statutory priorities:

- ☐ Initiatives to reform State teacher certification requirements that are designed to ensure that current and future teachers possess the necessary teaching skills and academic content knowledge in subject areas in which the teachers are certified or licensed to teach.
- ☐ Innovative reforms to hold institutions of higher education (IHE) with teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing teachers who are highly competent in academic content area in which the teachers plan to teach and have strong teaching skills.
- ☐ Development of innovative efforts aimed at reducing the shortage and high turnover of highly qualified teachers in high poverty urban and rural areas.

3. ACTIVITIES: Check *ONE OR MORE* of the following

This application proposes to carry out one or more of the following activities:

- ☐ **Reforms** - Implementing reforms that hold IHEs with teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing teachers who are highly competent in the academic content areas in which the use of rigorous subject matter competency tests and the requirement that a teacher have an academic major in the subject area, or related to discipline, in which teachers plan to teach.
- ☐ **Certification or Licensure Requirements** - Reforming teacher certification or licensure requirement to ensure that teachers have the necessary teaching skills and academic content knowledge in the subject areas in which teachers are assigned to teach.
- ☐ **Alternatives to Traditional Preparation for Teaching** - Providing prospective teachers with alternatives to traditional preparation for teaching through programs at colleges of arts and sciences or at nonprofit educational organizations.

- ☐ **Alternative Routes to State Certification** - Carrying out programs that (a) include support during the initial teaching experience; and (b) establish, expand, or improve alternative routes to State certification of teachers for highly qualified individuals, including mid career professionals from other occupations, paraprofessionals, former military personnel and recent college graduates with records of academic distinction.
- ☐ **Recruitment; Pay; Removal** - Developing and implementing effective mechanisms to ensure that local educational agencies and schools are able to effectively recruit highly qualified teachers, to financially reward those teachers and principals whose students have made significant progress toward high academic performance, such as through performance-based compensation systems and administrators, and to expeditiously remove incompetent or unqualified teachers consistent with procedures to ensure due process for the teachers.
- ☐ **Social Promotion** - Development and implementation of efforts to address the problem of social promotion and to effectively address the issues raised by ending the practice of social promotion.
- ☐ **Recruitment** - (1)(a) to award scholarships to help students pay the cost of tuition, room, board, and other expenses of completing a teacher preparation program; (b) to provide support services, if needed to enable scholarship recipients to complete postsecondary education programs; and (c) for follow-up services provided to former scholarship recipients during the recipients first three years of teaching; or (2) to develop and implement effective mechanisms to ensure that high need local educational agencies and schools are able to effectively recruit highly qualified teachers.

(Signature)

(Date)

**APPLICATION CHECKLIST
FOR
STATE GRANTS**

The Application (in this order):

Part I: Preliminary documents and the Narrative

- ☐ Application for Federal Assistance ED Form 424 (Face Sheet)
- ☐ Eligibility Checklist
- ☐ If applicable, a list of all cooperating entities for the project, contact persons, postal mail and email addresses, telephone and fax numbers
- ☐ Title Page
- ☐ Table of Contents
- ☐ Assurances
 - Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters: and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
 - Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion – Lower Tier Covered Transactions
 - Non-Construction Programs
 - Guidance on Section 427 of GEPA for new discretionary grant Awards
- ☐ Abstract (1 page only, not numbered, double-spaced)
- ☐ Program Narrative (the equivalent of no more than 50 double-spaced pages, 12 point font)

Part II: The Budget

- ☐ ED Budget Form 524 Section A (federal funds requested)
- ☐ ED Budget Form 524 Section B (matching funds provided)
- ☐ Detailed Line Item Budget
- ☐ Budget Narrative (detailed explanation and justification of costs in narrative form - this is in addition to the above required budget information - the equivalent of no more than 10 double-spaced pages, 12 point font)

Part III: The Appendices

- ☐ Work Plan that includes Project Objectives, Activities, Benchmarks, Timelines, Responsible Parties, Outcomes and Measures (the equivalent of no more than 10 double-spaced pages, 12 point font)
- ☐ Evaluation Plan (the equivalent of no more than 5 double-spaced pages, 12 point font)
- ☐ Job Descriptions of Key Personnel (if available, also include names and resumes)

- ☐ Letters of Support from the State governor and, if applicable, the state-governing agency and/or cooperative entities.
- ☐ Identifying material for cooperating LEAs and schools located in Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities.

Please check to make sure you have done the following:

- ☐ The Application for Federal Assistance ED Form 424 has been signed and dated by an authorized official and the signed original has been included with your submission.
- ☐ The budget amounts on ED Form 424, items 13(a-g) are for Year 1 only.
- ☐ You have included the original and five copies of the application, appendices, and forms.

Assurances: Required to Receive Federal Funding

GUIDANCE ON SECTION 427 OF GEPA

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the U.S. Department of Education's General Provisions Act (GEPA) that will apply to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Pub. L. 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new discretionary grant awards under the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need program. All applicants must include information in their applications to address this new provision in order to receive funding.

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires that each institution applying for funds to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure, for students, teachers, and other beneficiaries with special needs, equitable access to and participation in its Federally-assisted program.

This Section allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation that you may address: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you can determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation. Your description need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

How Might an Applicant Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

- (1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project servicing, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.
- (2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.
- (3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct “outreach” efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement *

The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to vary from 1 to 3 hours per response with an average of 1.5 hours, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather and maintain the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651.

* This burden statement applies only to GEPA section and not to the application.

Additional Reference Information

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Will the Department provide technical assistance to applicants?

The Department of Education will conduct several regional technical assistance workshops to assist prospective applicants in developing applications for the Partnership and State Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Programs. The locations and dates of these workshops may be found on the following page as well as on our web site at:
<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/heatqp/index.html>.

Who should be contacted for further information?

If you have specific questions, and would like to speak with program staff, you may contact us at:

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Programs
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Postsecondary Education
Telephone: 202/502/7878
Fax: 202/502/7699
Email: teacherquality@ed.gov

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8:00a.m. and 8:00 p.m., East Coast Time, Monday through Friday.

Where should I look for information about other funding opportunities from the Department of Education?

Information about the Department's funding opportunities, including copies of the notice inviting applications for other discretionary grant competitions, can be viewed on the Department's home page at:
www.ed.gov/funding.html.

**U.S. Department of Education
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants
Technical Assistance
Workshops**

The Department of Education has scheduled four regional Technical Assistance Workshops to assist prospective applicants interested in applying for Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants. The workshop agenda includes an overview of the State and Partnership grant programs, a description of the application requirements and selection criteria for each, and answers to general questions about the program and application process.

The times and locations for each of the workshops are set forth below.

Workshop Times: 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

**Workshop #1- April 13, 2000
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona**

Payne Building, Room# 129

Contact Persons: Kathy Langerman
(480)965-3146 or klang@asu.edu
and Jacky Olson
(480)965-3711 or jjolson@asu.edu

**Workshop # 2- April 18, 2000
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA**

Lower Dining Hall, Heights Room
140 Commonwealth Avenue
Contact Person: Pamela Herrup
(617)552-0763 or herrup@bc.edu

**Workshop #3- April 20, 2000
University of Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI**

University Center for Continuing
Education
161 West Wisconsin Avenue
Room# 7970

Contact Person: Linda Post
(414) 229-4884 or lpost@uwm.edu

**Workshop # 4- April 25, 2000
University of Miami
Coral Gables, FL**

University Center, Section A
Flamingo Ballroom
1306 Stanford Drive
Contact Person: Martha Kairuz
(305)284-5937 or
mkairuz@umiami.ir.miami.edu

For additional information on workshop locations including a list of hotels, please refer to TQ's web site at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/heatqp/>

Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs--Executive Order 12372

This information applies to each program that is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372 (Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs) and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79.

The objective of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and to strengthen federalism by relying on State and local processes for State and local government coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

Applicants must contact the appropriate State Single Point of Contact to find out about, and to comply with, the State's process under Executive Order 12372. Applicants proposing to perform activities in more than one State should immediately contact the Single Point of Contact for each of those States and follow the procedure established in each of those States under the Executive order. A listing containing the Single Point of Contact for each State is included below.

In States that have not established a process or chosen a program for review, State, area wide, regional, and local entities may submit comments directly to the Department.

Any State Process Recommendation and other comments submitted by a State Single Point of Contact and any comments from State, area wide, regional, and local entities must be mailed or hand-delivered by the date indicated in the actual application notice to the following address: The Secretary, EO 12372--CFDA# [commenter must insert number--including suffix letter, if any], U.S. Department of Education, Room 6213, 600 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202-0124.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ABOVE ADDRESS IS NOT THE SAME ADDRESS AS THE ONE TO WHICH THE APPLICANT SUBMITS ITS COMPLETED APPLICATION. DO NOT SEND APPLICATIONS TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

STATE SINGLE POINTS OF CONTACT

Note: In accordance with Executive Order #12372, this listing represents the designated State Single Points of Contact. Because participation is voluntary, some States and Territories no longer participate in the process. These include: Alabama, Alaska, American Samoa, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington.

The jurisdictions not listed no longer participate in the process. However, an applicant is still eligible to apply for a grant or grants even if its respective State, Territory, Commonwealth, etc. does not have a State Single Point of Contact.

ARIZONA

Ms. Joni Saad
Arizona State Clearinghouse
3800 N. Central Avenue
Fourteenth Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
Telephone: (602) 280-1315
FAX: (602) 280-8144
jonis@ep.state.az.us

ARKANSAS

Mr. Tracy L. Copeland
Manager, State Clearinghouse
Office of Intergovernmental Services
Department of Finance and Administration
1515 W. 7th Street, Room 412270
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203
Telephone: (501) 682-1074
FAX: (501) 682-520
tlcopeland@dfa.state.ar.us

CALIFORNIA

Grants Coordinator
State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning & Research
1600 Ninth Street, Room 250
Sacramento, California 95814
Telephone: (916) 323-7480
FAX: (916) 323-3018
No e-mail address

DELAWARE

Ms. Francine Booth
State Single Point of Contact
Executive Department
Office of the Budget
540 S. Dupont Highway Suite 5
Dover, Delaware 19903
Telephone: (302) 739-3326
FAX: (302) 739-5661 FAX:
fbooth@state.de.us

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Ron Seldon
State Single Point of Contact
Office of Grants Mgmt. & Development.
717 14th Street, N.W. - Suite 400200
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 727-6537
FAX: (202) 727-1617
rseldon-ogmd@dcm.gov

FLORIDA

Florida State Clearinghouse
Department of Community Affairs
22740 Centerview Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100
Telephone: (904) 922-5438
FAX: (904) 487-2899
Contact: Ms. Cherie Trainor
Telephone: (850) 414-5495
cherie.trainor@dca.state.fl.us

GEORGIA

Ms. Deborah Stephens
Coordinator
Georgia State Clearinghouse
270 Washington Street, S.W. - 8th Floor
Atlanta, GA 30334
Telephone: (404) 656-3855
FAX: (404) 656-7901
Ssda@mail.opb.state.ga.us

ILLINOIS

Ms. Virginia Bova, Single Point of Contact
Illinois Department of Commerce and
Community Affairs
James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph, Suite 3-400
Chicago, IL 60601
Telephone: (312) 814-6028
FAX: (312) 814-1800
No e-mail address

INDIANA

Ms. Frances Williams
State Budget Agency
212 State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2796
Telephone: (317) 232-2972
(317) 233-3323
No e-mail address

IOWA

Mr. Steven R. McCann
Division for Community Assistance
Iowa Department of Economic Development
East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50309
Telephone: (515) 242-4719
FAX: (515) 242-4809
steve.mccann@ided.state.ia.us

MISSISSIPPI

Ms. Cathy Mallette
Clearinghouse Officer
Department of Finance and Administration
550 High Street
303 Walters Sillers Building
Jackson, Mississippi 39302-3087
Telephone: (601) 359-6762
FAX: (601) 359-6758
No e-mail address

NORTH CAROLINA

Ms. Jeanette Furney
North Carolina Department
of Administration
116 West Jones Street - Suite 5106
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603-8003
Telephone:(919) 733-7232Telephone:
FAX:(919) 733-9571FAX:
jeanette_furney@mail.doa.state.nc.us

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota Single Point of Contact
Office of Intergovernmental
600 East Boulevard Avenue
Department 105
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0170
Telephone:(701) 224-2094
FAX:(701) 224-2308Telephone:
No e-mail address

RHODE ISLAND

Mr. Kevin Nelson
Review Coordinator
Department of Administration
Division of Planning
One Capitol Hill, 4th Floor
Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5870
Telephone:(401) 222-2280
FAX:(401) 277-2083 09
No e-mail address

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ms. Omeagia Burgess
State Single Point of Contact
Budget and Control Board
Office of the State Budget
1122 Ladies Street - 12th Floor
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Telephone:(803) 734-0494
FAX:(803) 734-0645
No e-mail address

NEW YORK

New York State Clearinghouse
Division of the Budget
State Capitol
Albany, New York 12224
Telephone: (518) 474-1605
FAX: (518) 486-5617
No e-mail address

WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Fred Cutlip, Director
Community Development Division
W. Virginia Development Office
Building #6, Room 553
Charleston, West Virginia 25305
(304) 558-4010
(304) 558-3248
fcutlip@wvdo.org

WISCONSIN

Mr. Jeff Smith
Assistant Section Chief, State/Federal Relations
Wisconsin Department of Administration
101 East Wilson Street - 6th Floor
P.O. Box 7868
Madison, Wisconsin 53707
(608) 266-0267
FAX:(608) 267-6931
sjt@mail.state.wy.us

WYOMING

Ms. Sandy Ross
State Single Point of Contact
Department of Administration and Information
2001 Capitol Avenue, Room 214
Cheyenne, WY 82002
Telephone:(307) 777-7446
FAX:(307) 632-39
sross1@missc.state.wy.us

TERRITORIES**GUAM**

Mr. Joseph Riviera, Acting Director
Bureau of Budget and Management Research
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 2950
Agana, Guam 96910
Telephone:(671) 475-9411 or 9412
FAX:(671) 472-2825
No e-mail address

TEXAS

Mr. Tom Adams
Governors Office
Director, Intergovernmental Coordination
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711
Telephone:(512) 463-1771
FAX:(512) 463-2681
(809) 727-4444
tadams@governor.state.tx.us

UTAH

Carolyn Wright
Utah State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning and Budget
State Capitol, Room 116
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Telephone:(801) 538-1535
FAX:(801) 538-1547

PUERTO RICO

Mr. Jose Caballero-Mercado, Chairman
Puerto Rico Planning Board
Federal Proposals Review Office
Minillas Government Center
P.O. Box 4119
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00940-1119
Telephone: (809) 723-6190
(809) 723-6190
FAX: (809) 724-3270
(809) 724-3103

NORTH MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. Alvaro A. Santos, Executive Officer
Office of Management and Budget
Office of the Governor
Saipan, MP 96950
Telephone: (670) 664-2256
FAX:(670) 664-2272
Contact:Ms. Jacoba T. Seman
Federal Programs Coordinator
Telephone:(670) 664-2289
FAX: (670) 664-2272
No e-mail address

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. Nellon Bowry
Director, Office of Management and Budget
41 Noregade Emancipation Garden
Second Floor
Saint Thomas, VI 00802
Contact:Ms. Linda Clarke
Telephone:(809) 774-0750
FAX:(809) 776-0069
No e-mail address

Note: This list is based on the most current information provided by the States. Information on any changes or apparent errors should be provided to Sherron Duncan (Telephone (202) 395-3120) at the Office of Management and Budget and to the State in question. Changes to the list will only be made upon formal notification by the State. The list is also published biannually in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

Important Notice to Prospective Participants in U.S. Department of Education Contract and Grant Programs

Grants

Applicants for grants from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) have to compete for limited funds.

Deadlines assure all applicants that they will be treated fairly and equally, without last minute haste.

For these reasons, ED must set strict deadlines for all grant applications. Prospective applicants can avoid disappointment if they understand that --

Failure to meet a deadline will mean that an application will be rejected without any consideration whatever.

The rules, including the deadline, for applying for each grant are published, individually, in the *Federal Register*. A one-year subscription to the Register may be obtained by sending \$340.00 to: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402-9371. (Send check or money order only, no cash or stamps.)

The instructions in the *Federal Register* must be followed exactly. Do not accept any other advice you may receive. No ED employee is authorized to extend any deadline published in the Register.

Questions regarding submission of applications may be addressed to:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Washington, DC 20202-4725

Contracts

Competitive procurement actions undertaken by ED are governed by the Federal Procurement Regulations and implementing ED Procurement Regulation.

Generally, prospective competitive procurement actions are synopsized in the Commerce Business Daily (CBD). Prospective offers are therein advised of the nature of the procurement and where to apply for copies of the Request for Proposals (RFP).

Offers are advised to be guided solely by the contents of the CBD synopsis and the instructions contained in the RFP. Questions regarding the submission of offers should be addressed to the Contracts Specialist identified on the face page of the RFP.

Offers are judged in competition with others and failure to conform with any substantive requirements of the RFP will result in rejection of the offer without any consideration whatever.

Do not accept any advice you receive that is contrary to instructions contained in either the CBD synopsis or the RFP. No ED employee is authorized to consider a proposal which is non-responsive to the RFP.

A subscription to the CBD is available for \$208.00 per year via second class mailing of \$261.00 per year via first class mailing. Information included in the Federal Acquisition Regulation is contained in Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter 1 (49.00). The foregoing publication may be obtained by sending your check or money order only, no cash or stamps, to:

Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402-9371

In an effort to be certain this important information is widely disseminated, this notice is being included in all ED mail to the public. You may, therefore, receive more than one notice. If you do, we apologize for any annoyance it may cause you.

Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)

TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT GRANTS

Goal: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The three initiatives authorized under Title II support Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by providing competitive grants to States for comprehensive teacher quality reforms; by providing competitive grants to partnerships of districts and institutions of higher education for fundamental improvements in teacher education; and by providing competitive grants to States and partnerships for new strategies for reducing shortages of qualified teachers in high-need areas.

FY 2000--\$98,000,000

FY 2001--\$98,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE OF NEW TEACHERS BY FUNDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATE POLICIES THAT STRENGTHEN INITIAL LICENSING STANDARDS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATE OR LOCAL POLICIES/PROGRAMS THAT REDUCE THE NUMBER OF UNCERTIFIED TEACHERS.

Indicator 1.1 Teacher certification standards. State Grantees: An external panel of experts will find that all states that use their grant to strengthen initial teacher certification standards will have implemented higher standards within three years of grant award. Within 1 1/2 years of the grant award, these states will have demonstrated progress toward implementation of higher standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data. Unable to judge. However, based on a review of State Grantee applications, 23 states indicated in their applications that they are in the process of reforming teacher certification standards, with either recent improvements made or intended improvements. The quality of these reforms is unknown; also unknown is whether grantees will actually carry out their intended reforms. Explanation: This is a new program so actual performance data are not yet available. (Examples of "progress toward implementation of higher standards" include establishment of a standards committee; state legislative action on standards; or development of draft standards).	Sources: State Report Card on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2001 Annual Program Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 National Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> Two updates <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual Program Performance Reports will contain self-reported data from grantees; State Report Card will contain self-reported data from states.
1999:	This is a new program for 1999	New Program		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		
2002:		100%		

Indicator 1.2 Certification rate. State, Recruitment and Partnership Grantees: The percentages of new and current teachers, who meet their state's teacher certification requirements, including passing content knowledge and competency tests, will increase each year.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data. Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: State Report Card on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2001 Annual Program Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 National Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> One update <i>Next Update:</i> 2003 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual Program Performance Reports will contain self-reported data from grantees; State Report Card will contain self-reported data from states.
1999:	This is a new program for 1999	New Program		
2000:		New Program		
2001:		New Program		

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY, PLACEMENT AND RETENTION RATES OF WELL-PREPARED, HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS IN HIGH-NEED SCHOOLS.

Indicator 2.1 Placement and retention. Partnership and Recruitment Grantees: There will be an increase each year in the percentage of graduates from teacher preparation programs with Partnership or Recruitment grants who serve for at least three years in high-need schools, particularly high-poverty schools in partnership districts.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data. Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Annual Program Performance Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 National Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> One update <i>Next Update:</i> 2003 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
1999:	This is a new program for 1999	New Program		
2000:		New Program		
2001:		New Program		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual Program Performance Reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
Indicator 2.2 Support for new teachers. Partnership and Recruitment Grantees: The percentage of new teachers in districts with Partnerships or Recruitment grants who receive on-going support services and education from their grant program for at least their first three years of teaching will increase each year.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data on actual grantee performance. However, based on a review of Recruitment Grantee applications, 11 Recruitment Grantees indicated that they offered support services to new teachers <i>prior to</i> receiving Title II funds in 1999. Based on a review of Recruitment Grantee applications, all 28 Recruitment Grantees proposed providing support services as a component of their Title II grant; these services include mentoring, professional development and induction programs. Based on a review of Partnership Grantee applications, all 25 Partnership Grantees proposed providing support services as components of their Title II; these services include professional development, mentoring, and peer networks. Explanation: This is a new program so actual performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Annual Program Performance Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 National Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> Two updates <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual Program Performance Reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
1999:	This is a new program for 1999	New Program		
2000:		New Program		
2001:		New Program		
2001:		New Program		

OBJECTIVE 3: IMPROVE THE ACADEMIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL TRAINING OF FUTURE TEACHERS.

Indicator 3.1 Content knowledge and teaching skills. Partnership and Recruitment Grantees: The percentage of graduates from teacher preparation programs with Partnership or Recruitment grants who demonstrate strong content knowledge and teaching skills in the subject they teach will increase each year.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data. Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Annual Program Performance Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 National Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> One update <i>Next Update:</i> 2003
1999:	This is a new program for 1999	New program		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		
2001:		New program		

Indicator 3.2 Technological skills. Partnership and State Grantees: The percentage of teachers from Partnership programs and grantee states who are prepared to integrate technology into the classroom will increase each year.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data. Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Annual Program Performance Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 National Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> One update <i>Next Update:</i> 2003 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual Program Performance Reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
1999:	This is a new program for 1999	New program		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		

OBJECTIVE 4: IMPROVE THE ABILITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS TO CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVE THEIR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS AND MEET THE STAFFING NEEDS OF PARTNER DISTRICTS.

Indicator 4.1 Process of self-assessment and improvement. Partnership and Recruitment Grantees: the percentage of teacher preparation programs with Partnership and Recruitment grants that have a formal process for assessing the effectiveness of their graduates as classroom teachers will increase each year.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data on actual grantee performance. However, based on a review of Recruitment Grantee applications, 8 Recruitment Grantees indicated they had a formal assessment process in place prior to receiving Title II funds. Based on a review of Recruitment Grantee applications, 19 Recruitment Grantees indicated they would develop an assessment process as part of their Title II activities; assessment activities include written or oral evaluation of teachers' work, student achievement data, and interviews with supervisors. Based on a review of Partnership applications, 23 Partnership Grantees indicated they will	Sources: Annual Program Performance Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 National Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> Two updates <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual Program Performance Reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
1999:	This is a new program for 1999	New Program		
2000:		New Program		
2001:		New Program		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
			develop an assessment process as part of their Title II activities; assessment activities include evaluations by other educators, student achievement data, INTASC standards, and teachers’ portfolios. Explanations: This is a new program so actual program performance data are not yet available.	
Indicator 4.2 Collaboration among partners. Partnership Grantees: The percentage of Partnership grantees with a governance structure that conducts a formal assessment of the staffing needs of local districts, monitors the effectiveness of partnership activities, and provides funds to partnership members for new activities will increase each year.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Grantees have a collaborative structure in place</i>			Status: Progress toward target is likely. Explanation: A high number of Partnership Grantees indicate in their program applications that they are currently undertaking many of the components of effective partnership collaboration.	Sources: Annual Program Performance Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 National Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> Two updates <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Baseline data from applications are self-reported and may reflect <i>intended</i> program activities, not <i>actual</i> program activities. Annual Program Performance Reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:	25*	New Programs		
2000:		25		
2001:		25		
<i>Grantees have a formal needs assessment process in place</i>				
1999:	22*	New Programs		
2000:		25		
2001:		25		
<i>Grantees monitor the effectiveness of partnership activities</i>				
1999:	24*	New Programs		
2000:		25		
2001:		25		
Grantees provide increasing funds to partnership members for new activities				
1999:	6*	New Programs		
2000:		25		
2001:		25		
* Baseline data				

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

To expand grantee awareness of promising practices and increase the pace of change in teacher education reform, the Title II program will disseminate information to grantees and prospective grantees in the following areas:

- ❖ Strategies that some states have used to improve certification standards, reduce the number of uncertified teachers, and hold teacher-training programs accountable for training highly skilled teachers.
- ❖ Upcoming awards program for teacher education programs and the lessons learned from the award winners. For example, learn how the programs measure the effectiveness of their graduates.
- ❖ Ways in which the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology, and other related programs can be used to support the program goals.
- ❖ Best practices in the field.
- ❖ **Teaching opportunities for students and recent graduates.**

To meet grantee and program performance goals, including comprehensive reform of teacher preparation programs, improved teacher recruitment practices and stronger state licensure systems, the Title II program will provide technical assistance and facilitate communication among grantees through the following means:

- ❖ Sponsoring activities such as focus groups, conferences, or workshops where participating partners can exchange information and ideas to enhance the success of the program.
- ❖ Sponsoring workshops to help grantees coordinate with the Eisenhower Professional Development Program.
- ❖ Providing technical assistance to partnerships in the development of assessment instruments.
- ❖ Helping grantee institutions share information on effective strategies.

To base program and grantee work on the best research and the best practices, the Title II program will coordinate with other programs and organizations, such as:

- ❖ The National Science Foundation's teacher preparation programs and NASA's teacher preparation activities.
- ❖ Professional organizations such as AACTE, NGA, NCSL, ACE, AASCU, SHEEO, CSSO, and INTASC to promote program goals.
- ❖ ED's Office of Postsecondary Education programs: Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology and GEAR UP; and ED's Office of Vocational Education's teacher education initiative.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- ❖ Coordination includes involving NASA's teacher preparation program grantees in technical assistance and dissemination activities with Title II grantees, starting with the first Title II project directors conference in January. Coordination efforts will also involve the teacher preparation programs run through the National Science Foundation.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- ❖ The capability of the Title II office to provide extensive technical assistance to grant recipients.
- ❖ The ability of grant recipients to:
 - ♦ Develop leadership support in their states or on campuses;
 - ♦ Build broad collaborative partnerships with key stakeholders; and
 - ♦ Develop strategies to sustain the project after federal funding ends.

Grant recipients must overcome decades of neglect for teacher preparation programs among campus leaders such as presidents, provosts, and members of the arts and sciences community. Securing the personal involvement of these leaders for the restructuring of teacher preparation programs is a crucial, but often difficult task to achieve. The support and involvement of campus leaders in teacher preparation programs is a precondition to policy and practice changes (such as changing faculty expectations or creating a faculty reward system). It is also a necessary precondition to obtaining financial support that ensures that high quality teacher preparations becomes a university-wide priority and remains a priority after federal Title II funding ends.

- ❖ **Ensuring sustained political and public interest in and support of the Title II programs.**

INDICATOR CHANGES

From two years old Annual plan (FY 1999)

- ❖ No changes. This was a new 1999 program.

From last year's Annual Plan (FY 2000)

Adjusted

- ❖ Several indicators have been combined since last year to reduce the overall number of indicators. The purpose of this adjustment was to combine indicators from last year's plan that were similar to each other into one indicator for the FY 2001 Plan.
- ❖ The following changes were made: former indicators 1.3, 3.1, and 6.1 were combined to indicator 1.2 for the FY 2001 Plan; former indicators 3.2, 3.3, and 6.3 were combined to indicator 2.1 in the FY 2001 Plan; and former indicators 2.1 and 6.2 were combined to indicator 2.2 for the FY 2001 Plan.
- ❖ The wording of several indicators was slightly adjusted and given new indicator numbers; in the FY 2001 Plan, these are indicators 3.2, 4.1 and 4.2.

Dropped

- ❖ Indicator 2.2 was dropped since last year's plan. This indicator was a process indicator, measuring enrollment in academic courses, rather than an outcome indicator.

New – None.

Changes from FY 1999 to FY 2001

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 1.1 (State and local assessments) was modified for FY 2000. The FY 2000 indicator remains unchanged in FY 20001, except for its Indicator number, which is described above.
- ❖ Indicator 1.2 (NAEP reading and math) was modified for FY 2000 to target performance of the lowest achieving students and students in the highest-poverty public schools as well as being re-numbered as Indicator 1.1 (a shared indicator with Goals 2000). The FY 2001 indicator remains the same as FY 2000.
- ❖ Indicator 2.2 (Standards and assessments) was modified by dropping the assessment indicator and including in standards piece in FY 2000 Indicator 2.1 (Use of challenging standards) FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) brings back the FY 99 assessment piece that had been dropped in FY 2000.
- ❖ Indicator 2.3 (Research-based curriculum and instruction) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.4.
- ❖ Indicator 2.4 (Extended learning time) was slightly modified in FY 2000 and numbered as Indicator 2.3.
- ❖ Indicator 2.5 (Services to private school students) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.7 to delete "more effective communication, consultation, and services" and substitute with "effective implementation of on-site services to students". For FY 2001, the indicator has been dropped as described above.
- ❖ Indicator 3.2 (Qualified teacher aides) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.6 to shift the focus from credentials to district support for the educational improvement through career ladders for paraprofessionals/aides. FY 2001 Indicator 2.5 retains the FY 2000 Indicator and expands to include qualified staff in Title I schools.
- ❖ Indicator 4.1 (Implementing high standards) was slightly modified as FY 2000 Indicator 3.1 (Establishing annual progress measures) and dropped in FY 2001.
- ❖ Indicator 4.2 (Linked assessments) was modified slightly in FY 2000 Indicator 3.2 (Aligned assessments) and substantially maintained as FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (Aligned assessments).
- ❖ Indicator 4.3 (Accountability: monitoring, intervention and assistance) was significantly changed in FY 2000 Indicator to assess only the provision of "effective assistance to schools not making progress through school support teams and other sources". The FY 2001 Indicator 3.3 remains the same as FY 2000 but has been expanded to include public school enrollment options as described above.
- ❖ Indicator 5.1 (School-parent compacts) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 to delete "school staff and parents will report" and replace it with "Title I participating schools will report". The FY 2001 Indicator 2.3 has been changed to reflect a broader assessment of the effectiveness of parental involvement programs.
- ❖ Indicator 5.2 (Improved attendance and homework completion) was not included in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 but used instead as performance

EMPOWERMENT ZONES AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES

What are the Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities, and where are they located?

The Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community program is a critical element of the Administration's community revitalization strategy. The program is the first step in rebuilding communities in America's poverty-stricken inner cities and rural heartlands. It is designed to empower people and communities by inspiring Americans to work together to create jobs and opportunity.

In 1995, the Departments of Agriculture (USDA) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD) designated a number of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities based on locally-developed strategic plans that comprehensively address how the community will link economic development with education and training, as well as how community development, public safety, human services, and environmental initiatives together will support sustainable communities. Designated areas receive Federal grant funds and substantial tax benefits and have access to other Federal programs.

The Department of Education is supporting the Empowerment Zone and the Enterprise Community initiative in a variety of ways. For example, it is encouraging zones to use funds they already receive from Department programs (including Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, the Adult Education Act, and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act) to support the comprehensive vision of their strategic plans. In addition, the Department of Education is giving preferences to Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities in a number of discretionary grant programs that are well suited for inclusion in a comprehensive approach to economic and community development.

The currently designated Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities are the communities located within the cities and counties listed below. Please check the following websites for the most updated information: www.ezec.gov and www.hud.gov/cpd/ezec/ezbyez.html.

*CURRENTLY DESIGNATED
EMPOWERMENT ZONES AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES*

(*denotes rural designee)

Rural and Urban Empowerment Zones (EZ)

CALIFORNIA:	Los Angeles; Santa Ana
CONNECTICUT:	New Haven
FLORIDA:	Miami-Dade County
GEORGIA:	Atlanta
ILLINOIS:	Chicago
INDIANA:	Gary/East Chicago
ILLINOIS:	Hammond
ILLINOIS/MISSOURI:	East St. Louis/St. Louis
KENTUCKY:	Kentucky Highlands*
MARYLAND:	Baltimore
MASSACHUSETTS:	Boston
MICHIGAN:	Detroit
MINNESOTA:	Minneapolis
MISSISSIPPI:	Mississippi Delta*
MISSOURI:	Kansas City
MISSOURI/ILLINOIS:	St. Louis/East St. Louis
NEW JERSEY:	Cumberland County
NEW JERSEY/PENNSYLVANIA:	Camden/Philadelphia
NEW YORK:	New York/Bronx County
OHIO:	Cincinnati; Cleveland; Columbus
OHIO/WEST VIRGINIA:	Huntington/Ironton
PENNSYLVANIA/NEW JERSEY:	Philadelphia/Camden
SOUTH CAROLINA:	Columbia/Sumter
SOUTH DAKOTA:	Ogala Sioux-Pine Ridge*
TENNESSEE:	Knoxville
TEXAS:	El Paso; Rio Grande Valley*; Houston
WEST VIRGINIA/OHIO:	Ironton/Huntington
VIRGINIA:	Norfolk/Portsmouth

Rural and Urban Enhanced Enterprise Communities (Enhanced EC)

CALIFORNIA:	Oakland
KANSAS/MISSOURI:	Kansas City, KS/Kansas City, MO
MASSACHUSETTS:	Boston
MISSOURI/KANSAS:	Kansas City, MO/Kansas City, KS
TEXAS:	Houston

Rural and Urban Enterprise Communities (EC)

ALABAMA:	Birmingham; Chambers County*; Green & Sumter County*
ARIZONA:	Arizona Border Region*; Phoenix
ARKANSAS:	East Central Arkansas*; Little Rock; Mississippi County*
CALIFORNIA:	Imperial County*; Los Angeles; San Diego; San Francisco; City of Watsonville/County of Santa Cruz*
COLORADO:	Denver
CONNECTICUT:	Bridgeport; New Haven
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:	Washington, DC
DELAWARE:	Wilmington
FLORIDA:	Dade County; Jackson County*; Tampa
GEORGIA:	Albany; Central Savannah River*; Crisp/Dooly County*
IOWA:	Des Moines
ILLINOIS:	East St. Louis; Springfield
INDIANA:	Austin*; Indianapolis
KENTUCKY:	Louisville; Scott/McCreary Area*
LOUISIANA:	Macon Ridge*; New Orleans; Northeast Louisiana Delta*; Ouachita Parish
MASSACHUSETTS:	Lowell; Springfield
MICHIGAN:	Flint; Lake County*; Muskegon
MINNESOTA:	Minneapolis; St. Paul
MISSISSIPPI:	Jackson; North Delta Mississippi*
MISSOURI:	City of East Prairie*; Mississippi County*; St. Louis
NEBRASKA:	Omaha
NEW JERSEY:	Newark
NEW HAMPSHIRE:	Manchester
NEW MEXICO:	Albuquerque; La Jicarita*

NEVADA:	Clarke County; Las Vegas/N. Las Vegas
NEW YORK:	Albany-Troy; Buffalo; Newburgh; Rochester; Schenectady
NORTH CAROLINA:	Charlotte; Halifax/Edgecombe/Wilson Alliance*; Robeson County*
OHIO:	Akron; Columbus
OKLAHOMA:	Oklahoma City; Southeast Oklahoma*
OREGON:	Josephine County*; Portland
PENNSYLVANIA:	Harrisburg; Pittsburgh
RHODE ISLAND:	Providence
SOUTH CAROLINA:	Charleston; Williamsburg-Lake City*
SOUTH DAKOTA:	Beadle & Spink Counties*
TENNESSEE:	Fayette County/Haywood County*; Memphis; Nashville-Davidson; Scott/McCreary Area*
TEXAS:	Dallas; El Paso; San Antonio; Waco
UTAH:	Ogden
VERMONT:	Burlington
VIRGINIA:	Accomack & Northampton County*; Norfolk
WASHINGTON:	Seattle; Tacoma
WEST VIRGINIA:	Central Appalachia*; Huntington; McDowell County*
WISCONSIN:	Milwaukee; Northwoods Nijji*

GRANT APPLICATION RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

If you fail to receive the notification of application receipt within fifteen (15) days from the closing date call:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
(202) 708-9493

GRANT AND CONTRACT FUNDING INFORMATION

The Department of Education provides information about grant and contract opportunities electronically in several ways:

ED Internet Home Page <http://www.ed.gov> (WWW address)

OCFO Web Page Internet <http://ocof.ed.gov> (WWW address)